## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA CHARLOTTE DIVISION

Civil Action No. 3:16-CV-656-GCM

MICHAEL TINSLEY,	
Plaintiff, v.	ORDER
CITY OF CHARLOTTE	
Defendant.	

**THIS MATTER** is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Seal Exhibits Attached to Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 45). Defendant consents to this Motion.

When a party makes a request to seal judicial records, the Court must (1) give the public notice and a reasonable opportunity to challenge the request to seal; (2) "consider less drastic alternatives to sealing;" and (3) if it decides to seal, make specific findings and state the reasons for its decision to seal rather than choosing other alternatives. *Va. Dep't of State Police v. Washington Post*, 386 F.3d 567, 576 (4th Cir. 2004). In accordance with the law of this Circuit as well as the Local Rules, the Court has considered the Motion to Seal, the public's interest in access to such materials, and alternatives to sealing. The public has been provided with adequate notice and an opportunity to object to Plaintiff's motion. Plaintiff filed the motion on June 1, 2018, and it has been accessible to the public through the Court's electronic case filing system since that time. The Court determines that no less restrictive means other than sealing is sufficient because a public filing of such materials would reveal personal information of third parties and sensitive documents related to Internal Affairs investigations. The Court concludes

that the sealing of these documents is narrowly tailored to serve the interest of protecting this information.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the Motion to Seal (Doc. No. 45) is hereby **GRANTED**, and all of the exhibits attached to Doc. No. 47 are to be filed under seal until further Order of this Court.

SO ORDERED.

Signed: June 18, 2018

Graham C. Mullen

United States District Judge